



United State's Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,428	05/30/2001	Thomas Alan Slopsema	GP-301083	7065
7:	590 03/11/2003			
	ER DEVRIES		EXAMINER CASTRO, ARNOLD	
General Motors Legal Staff, Ma	Corporation iil Code 482-C23-B21			
P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Detroit, MI 48	3203-3000		3747	
			DATE MAILED: 03/11/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	\overline{a}
Advisory Action	09/870,428	SLOPSEMA ET AL.	
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Arnold Castro	3747	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addre	9SS
THE REPLY FILED 04 March 2003 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whic	ation. A proper reply h places the applicati	to a ion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this a no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 (c)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the approperation of the fee. The approportionally set in the final O	n. See MPEP priate extension priate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the second s	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sim	plifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims	
Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	mendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because: <u>Se</u>		idered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examin	er.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
• .			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not germane to the claimed invention. Applicant argued that Gospodar is silent and does not teach or suggest a computerized controller to control a throttle. The examiner agrees in fact at the time of Gospodar's invention electronic controllers did not exist. However, applicant does not claim a computerized throttle controller, as one of ordinary skill in the art today would consider to be an electrical throttle. Applicants claim invention encompasses mechanical throttle valves as shown in Gospodar. All applicant is claim to be computerized is the closing of the throttle valve at shut down. "a computerized controller configured to control said throttle such that a substantial termination of said intake charge of air is provided during shutdown" Computerizing the control of the switch that controls the electromagnet (12,13) of Gospodar would suffice for anticipation of claimed invention. Nyfelt teaches using a computer to control an ignition switch to shutdown a car. The switch is performing the same function in both Gospodar and Nyfelt. Motivation has been cited. The claim rejection stand for these reasons.

Henry C.Yuen
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700